DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 386 667 CG 026 497

AUTHOR Ronkonen, Lyyli; Skripjuk, Igor
TITLE The Problem of Personality in Soviet and Russian Pedagogics. Research Bulletin 86.
INSTITUTION Helsinki Univ. (Finland). Dept. of Education.
REPORT NO ISBN-951-45-6613-0; ISSN-0359-5749
PUB DATE 94
NOTE 51p.; Prepared within the context of Professor Erkki A. Niskanen's Research Project: "Personality as an Educational Development."
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Foreign Countries; *Instruction; Motivation; Orientation; *Personality; *Personality Assessment; Personality Studies; Personality Theories; *Personality Traits; Psychological Studies; Psychology; Social Psychology; Sociology
IDENTIFIERS *Russia; *USSR

ABSTRACT

There is no comprehensive understanding of the idea of personality in Soviet and Russian pedagogics. Past discussions about personality have focused on personality orientation as determined by the prevailing motives that explain the behavior and conduct of man. In soviet psychology, the nature of man is considered to be his relations to other men, to his surrounding ecological and social spheres, to his occupation, and to himself. In pedagogics, personality has a rather wide dimension. Considering the varied interpretations, it is clear that the idea of personality has many aspects, each of which needs investigation. Early Russian reference sources did not even contain the word "personality" as a separate entry, despite the fact that Russian philosophers paid a great deal of attention to human problems. As time passed, various definitions of personality emerged. The nature of personality cannot be understood outside its relations to society, however. In a sense, personality is a reflection of the historical conditions of a person's life. Yet historical context cannot account for all the specific behaviors, motives and values that make up an individual's personality. The personality is a hierarchy of relationships, those representing the major needs and interests being at the top. They form the nucleus, which influences all other relationships of an individual, their stability and other qualities. (Contains 156 references.) (KW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 386 667

Department of Education

University of Helsinki

RESEARCH BULLETIN 86

Lyyli Ronkonen and Igor Skripjuk

THE PROBLEM OF PERSONALITY IN SOVIET AND RUSSIAN PEDAGOGICS

Research Project
Personality as an Educational Phenomenon
by Professor Erkki A. Niskanen

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. NISKANEN

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

TC 026497

RESEARCH BULLETIN 86

Lyyli Ronkonen and Igor Skripjuk

THE PROBLEM OF PERSONALITY IN SOVIET AND RUSSIAN PEDAGOGICS

Research Project
Personality as an Educational Phenomenon
by Professor Erkki A. Niskanen

3

Helsinki 1994

Department of Education
P.O. Box 39 (Bulevardi 18)
FIN-00014 University of Helsinki
Finland

Tel.int. +358 0 1911
Telefax +358 0 191 8073

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS 1

1 THE PROBLEM OF PERSONALITY IN SOVIET AND RUSSIAN PEDAGOGICS 3

1.1 General Considerations 3

2 PERSONALITY AS AN OBJECT OF STUDY IN SOVIET PSYCHOLOGY AND PEDAGOGICS 8

2.1 General Understanding of Personality in Soviet Science 8

3 CONCEPTIONS OF PERSONALITY IN SOVIET PSYCHOLOGY (from the general psychological approach) 13

3.1 Sources of Psychological Conceptions of Personality 13

3.2 Basic Methodological Principles and General Trends in Soviet Psychological Studies of Personality 14

3.3 Objectives of Psychology in Personality Psychology 20

3.4 The General Concept of Personality 23

3.5 Active Nature of Personality 25

3.6 Personality and Consciousness 31

3.7 Time-Related Nature of Personality 32

REFERENCES 34

I 79570

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The article was planned to be primarily written by me alone, but the subject and its investigation turned out to be so demanding and complicated that I had to turn for help to Russian investigators of the problem. Docent Igor Skripjuk of Herzen University in St. Petersburgh graciously agreed to assist me in my work.

Professor Skripjuk's part in the work was so essential that he is now co-author of this publication. While preparing this publication, I worked as an assistant to Professor Erkki A. Niskanen at the Faculty of Education of Helsinki University. I had a happy opportunity to become involved in Professor Niskanen's large project entitled "Personality as an Educational Phenomenon".

In 1982 the VIII World Congress of the Association for Educational Research was organized in Helsinki. The theme of the Congress was "Personality - Education - Society".

I assisted Professor Niskanen, president of the congress, as an interpreter of the Russian, English, and Finnish languages, thus gaining deeper insight into the theme of the congress and the idea of personality. For many years I assisted Professor Niskanen as a Russian interpreter in his discussions of the problem of personality with Russian-speaking professors and scientists, mostly from Moscow and St. Petersburgh, who came to visit our faculty.

Scientifically remarkable discussions on the above mentioned problem were held with Professor J. K. Babansky, the Vice President of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of the USSR, and academician N. F. Talyzina. Professor Niskanen entrusted me with the task of producing an article on the problem of personality as a pedagogical phenomenon as discussed in Russian pedagogical literature.

The facts that Professor Niskanen had written much on the subject and that there were many publications on the problem as part of the project led by him, helped the task of producing given paper. Professor Niskanen constantly supervised and guided me in my work giving valuable advice. He formulated the structure and essential outline of the whole work. Professor Niskanen's (1990) publication *Personality as an Educational Phenomenon* was of great help for our investigation.

While preparing the work for publication, authors I. I. Skripjuk and I enlarged its primary content using new Russian materials from latest investigations on the problem.

In finishing the task, we express our grateful acknowledgments to Professor Niskanen for entrusting to us an interesting task for an investigation and for unstintingly giving his time, experience, suggestions, and continuous support. I also thank him for granting me the best possible conditions under which to work on this problem at the Faculty of Education of the University of Helsinki.

We express our gratitude and acknowledgments to the previous head of the Faculty of Education, Professor Anna-Liisa Leino, for her continued support and help while preparing the publication. We are deeply thankful to current head of the faculty, Associate Professor Kari E. Nurmi, for granting us the opportunity to publish the work in the Research Bulletin Series. We are grateful and obliged to Russians scientists and investigators for their help, particularly to Professor J. K. Babansky, Professor N. F. Talyzina, and Professor A. D. Boborykin.

We are most grateful to Afiye Bavautdin for her help and support in writing and publishing this work.

In Helsinki and St. Petersburgh,
March 1994

L. Ronkonen, Doctor of Philology,
Docent at Helsinki University in 1980-1992,
Professor at Herzen University in St. Petersburgh, 1974-1980

I. I. Skripjuk, Doctor of Psychological Sciences,
Docent at Herzen University in St. Petersburgh

1 THE PROBLEM OF PERSONALITY IN SOVIET AND RUSSIAN PEDAGOGICS

1.1 General Considerations

There is no comprehensive understanding of the idea of personality in Soviet and Russian pedagogics. Various authors give various explanations of the idea of personality. Psychological investigations of personality include the ideas of capacity, tempo, individual abilities, world outlook, as well as the concepts of personal orientation and motivation.

In discussions about the personality problem in the works of A. N. Leontjev, of L. I. Božovits, and of E. V. Tšudnovsky, the main focus has been on personality orientation as determined by prevailing motives that explain the behavior and conduct of man.

In his investigation *Introduction to Psychology*, P. J. Galperin underlines the fact that in discussing the personality problem it should be paralleled with ideas such as organism, individuum, subject, man, individuality, and also character and temperament.

The complication in such parallel constructions lies in the fact that they all refer to the idea of man. In differentiation of these notions some authors attempt to differentiate in its context the biological and social essence. But in defining man as personality this is not enough - as a subject it includes in itself biological and social elements.

At the same time, in the works of social psychology and general psychology the problem of personality is connected with the motivational orientation of man. This understanding of personality is close to Leontjevs definition of it, the latter introducing the notion of "sense". "Sense" reveals the coordination of aims and motives in man's behavior. Notions of "sense" and "value" reveal the same essence in understanding man.

We think that the most adequate understanding of personality in its direct meaning is given by Galperin in his above mentioned investigation. He considers man's personal traits to be revealed in his relations to other men, in his understanding of duty towards other people.

The extent of personality maturity corresponds to the extent of his responsibility to other people, to his surroundings, and to his work. From this point of view we may say that man's personality is his morality, his views on life. In this case man's nature reveals different aspects of his personality.

In Soviet psychology the nature of man is considered to be his relations to other men, to his surrounding ecological and social spheres, to his occupation, and to himself. The extent of responsibility in these relations characterizes personality.

At the same time the extent of responsibility is regarded from the position of a certain morality. It is quite natural that personality is not inborn, it is developed during a certain period of life in the process of living. As it is, until a certain age man is not responsible for his behavior or for his deeds. Only upon reaching a certain age is man punished for breaking moral norms and for irresponsible behavior.

The nucleus of personality as a system of relations is given detailed analysis in the works of V. N. Mjasiščev.

A slightly different approach to the problem of personality is presented in the works of V. V. Davydov, who connects personality with the creative abilities of man.

In pedagogics, personality has a rather wide dimension. The notion of personality is identified with the notion of "man". As it is, in pedagogics we speak about the overall development of personality, meaning not only moral but aesthetic, physical, and mental development. As for man's individual character traits - they might be on different levels. For example, man's temperament is characterized by inherited traits of the nervous system (individuum level).

Man's abilities and emotions are also highly individualized. All this concerns the subject of reflection (different sides of man's psychology).

Individual personality traits are reflected in the nature of man, if we assume Galperin's understanding of personality as being revealed in a man's responsibility towards other people and his surroundings.

Considering all this we conclude that the idea of personality has many aspects, each of which needs additional investigation.

Man's activity as an individual does not only mean securing his elementary life functions, and is not only oriented to the sphere of social connections and relations - it has a creative, transforming nature which enables man to develop himself and to achieve effective activity.

Variety in man's activity is an expression of his individuality. We may define several approaches to the concept of personality. These definitions are different if we analyze personality from different viewpoints - philosophical, sociological, and psychological.

In philosophy:

"Personality in its general meaning is a concrete, generalized individuality of man in the unity of his natural and social qualities. In the narrow, philosophical sense personality is an individuum, the subject of social activity, the qualities of which are determined by concrete historical conditions of the life of the society". (Kratki slovarj po philosophi, 1979.)

According to V. P. Tugarinov's works, personality is a man with a certain historically determined degree of reasoning and responsibility before society, using certain rights and freedoms and leading a way of life that corresponds to the ideals of the epoch (Tugarinov 1965, 88).

According to M. B. Demin personality is a man as a social being, as a member of society possessing certain individual qualities (Demin 1977, 53).

L. P. Bueva considers personality to be a man as a combination of social qualities that were formed through the duration of different kinds of social activities and relations (Bueva 1971, 26).

Although social, philosophical and sociological approaches to the concept of personality have much in common, sociological analysis of the phenomenon has its peculiarities.

According to V. A. Jadov personality is regarded by a sociologist not as an individuality, but as a depersonified personality, as a social type, or as a deindividualized personality (Jadov 1969, 13).

In E. V. Šorohova's opinion, the basis of the social psychological approach to the concept of personality is the definition of a social

type of personality as a specific formation, as a product of social conditions and structures, as a combination of role functions of personality and its influence on social life (Šorohov 1975, 66).

The difference in approaches to the personality problem from social psychological and sociological positions is in the fact that social psychology strives to determine the process of the formation of social -typical qualities of personality. In social psychology personality is defined as a complex of factors of social determination, the activity and conduct of socially determined personality in concrete social groups, and its contribution to this activity.

In analyzing personality from a social psychological position the main focus is the study of personality in its relations and connections to the group.

Accordingly, there are two main trends in the personality problem in social psychology - the problem of the socialization of personality and the problem of social installation.

Socialization of personality is a double process - on one side it implies assimilation of social experience through adaptation, and on the other side it implies the process of active reproduction of the system of social sphere relations.

The social orientation of personality is its capacity to react to various phenomena in social reality. The general psychological and pedagogical interpretation of personality implies the study of man as a combination of psychological qualities that determine the forms of his social behavior and activity (Šorohova, 1969).

In interpreting the concept of personality, S. L. Rubinštein emphasizes the significance of the system of motives determining man's activity and his ability to realize his faculties in the surrounding historical and social spheres (Rubinštein 1959, 119-120).

Contrary to the sociological approach, the psychological concept of personality emphasizes the study of the inner subjective qualities of a man that make him a personality, that make him a member of society, and that motivate his activity and conduct.

In sociology, personality is the subject of historical, socio-economic processes, it's product, the result of the socialization of an individuum.

In general psychology the main focus of the study of personality is on personality's inner nature, on the role of psychological qualities and processes, on the perception of the outer social sphere, on the study of the regulating functions of man's character, temperament, and abilities, and on the activity and conduct of man.

As for social psychology, its study of personality implies the concrete historical investigation of the peculiarities of psychological qualities and of the inner structure of personality as a subject of social relations in certain socially concrete circumstances.

2 PERSONALITY AS AN OBJECT OF STUDY IN SOVIET PSYCHOLOGY AND PEDAGOGICS

2.1 General Understanding of Personality in Soviet Science

Specificity of philosophical, sociological, pedagogical, and social-pedagogical approaches to the interpretation of personality

In discussing and solving any problem one of the main things is to specify a system of categories. That is why it is essential to determine the meanings of such ideas as "individuum", "organism", "individuality" and "subject of activity" as they are understood in Soviet science.

On the one hand, these categories reflect dialectical unity of man's virtue (character), on the other hand each of them has its specific features, which means they are not identical. The understanding of an individuum as a specimen of man's genus is widely spread. This view is supported by E. V. Šorohova (Šorohova 1980, 45-57).

More complicated are notions such as "organism" and "personality" as reflecting the inner essence of man: "The existence of various ideas and notions about one and the same object - man - may be explained by some principles of dialectical logics. We mean by this the principles of structural and attributive relativity, the meaning of which is in logical fixation of the fact, that revealing various characteristics of an object is dependent upon the field of its reciprocal action" and that "one and the same object might be an element and undersystem not of one, but of several systems of higher rank and in such a case it will posess various structures, mutually correlative" (Seržantov 1972, 123-132).

According to this principle, organism and personality reflect qualitative aspects of man in relation to biological and social systems. In expressing connections between these notions we assume that "the relations of organism and personality are relations of mutual penetration, as these concepts do not express two different layers of reality, but two aspects of the same reality of man's individuum" (Seržantov 1974, 60).

It should be mentioned that we have a variety of definitions and interpretations characterizing the essence of man and his peculiar traits. This is justified in that the richer the defined object, the more sides it offers for interpretation, and the more numerous definitions it requires. This approach might be the most propitious since we should investigate and analyze all sides and aspects of an object to comprehend it wholly and totally.

Because we have no unique interpretation of man and his characteristics, we discuss the different conceptions of various authors, but before doing so we should mention two essential intentions:

1. We'll attempt to analyze from the same methodological positions the relations and connections between the concpets "individuum", "man", "personality", "individuality", and "the subject of activity".

2. We will categorize these concepts in terms of the following approaches: philosophical, sociological, general sociological, general psychological, pedagogical, social-pedagogical.

But the pedagogical approach is in reality an integrated formation, reproducing in some respect psychological and social psychological interpretations of the personality problem. As it is, the pedagogical approach will not be discussed separately. The most attention will be given to the psychological perspective on the problem of "personality".

The Summary Table of Interpretations of Concepts from Different Aspects

	Man	Personality	Individuality	The subject of activity
philosophy	The place in the system of universe	Social-historical type (on macro level, for ex. epoch), on the level of culture and history	Specific (singular) form of integral existence of man in surrounding the world. The subject: study of structural qualities of integrity	The source of general qualities of subject activity that means the specific activity of man in his assimilation external world and self-development
sociology	Nonspecific concept "individ"	Social type as mentioned above including the system of roles and socially concrete functions and as product (object) of socialization	This is an individual agent of image: social life and concrete subject of individual style of life	Subject type that means the active start of concrete forms of activity. For ex: man as a universal, estranged labourer implying that one domineers and another is suppressed
psychology	General scientific meaning representing biological species	The maximum generalization unification of psychological qualities, processes and relations	Biosociological unity of natural inclinations, psychological qualities and processes	Biosocial potentiality of activity or ability to act reflected in various styles, (for ex. cognitive styles)
social psychology	Nonspecific concept "individuum"	Social- concrete integrity of psychological qualities, processes and relations as the system of dispositions (motives and needs)	The expression of social individuality in specific system of dispositions on alla levels/orientation of interests - situational social arrangements	Subject - type of socially concrete types of activity mainly in the sphere of communication (group and individual). The main types: nonconformist, leader etc.

In ordinary life the concepts "individuum", "personality", "individuality" are very often mixed up. They are used as synonyms although they are not. Frequently this kind of confusion appears in scientific literature where the concepts of "individuum" and "individuality" are most often confused.

But they are different concepts. Individuum is a man as a unique product of nature, representing a separate type of species, which means the concept of "individuum" fixed his belonging to the human race. "Individuum" is applied to a mature, normal man, to a newly-born baby, and to a man with defects in all spheres and functions, but only the mature, normal man is a personality.

In the psychological dictionary "individuum" means not divided, indivisible. In "Kratki psihologitšeski slovarj" (1985, 114) the concept of man is defined:

"Man is a unified natural creature, representing the type Homo Sapiens, a product of phylogenetic and ontogenetic development, the unity of inherited and achieved, bearer of individual qualities, abilities, and inclinations etc."

The general characteristics of an individuum include integrity of psychophysis organization, and stability in the coordination between the outer world and activity. The activity of an individuum ensures its ability to change itself in accordance with life situations. But personality in its turn is a system of qualities acquired by an individuum in its activity, communication, and social relations. That means the concept of "individuum" implies biological potentiality, whereas personality implies social potentiality. The concepts of individuum and personality are used to define a man in general, on a generalized, categorical level.

In characterizing man as an individuum or personality we do not mean a concrete man with his name, but man in general, in an abstract sense. We mean here everything concerning people. The characteristics of man as an individuum and personality are highly generalized. We need them to differentiate a man from not-a-man, to differentiate a representative of Homo-Sapiens from other biological species to differentiate a man in social surroundings from a man as a biological being, as an organism, and to differentiate a man as an individuum from a man as personality, which means to define in man two different poles - the biological and the social.

When we characterize a concrete man by defining his individual personal qualities, we use the concept "individuality".

Individuality means the psychic of mental peculiarities of an individuum and personality, the unique combination of qualities in an individuum and personality, the biological and social aspects of a man.

We have here the phenomenon of double refraction - characteristics of a man as an individuum are refracted through the system of social connections and relations.

Thus, inidividuality is characterized by integrity, creative activity, and variety in conduct.

3 CONCEPTIONS OF PERSONALITY IN SOVIET PSYCHOLOGY (from the general psychology approach)

3.1 Sources of Psychological Conceptions of Personality

Philosophy, natural sciences, and pedagogics have all contributed to the major ideas and conceptions concerning human personality.

In particular, Russian philosophers of the 17th and 18th centuries paid a great deal of attention to the problems of human beings. The ideas developed by A. N. Radiščev and A. Galič, the legacy of the revolutionary democrats V. G. Belinsky, A. I. Herzen, N. A. Dobrolyubov, and N. G. Černyševsky, may be regarded as the philosophical sources of materialistic ideas for the sciences concerned with humans in the pre-Marxist period.

The first psychological laboratory was established in Russia by V. M. Bekhterev, just a few years after Wundt, and it laid foundation for natural science to study personality experimentally.

Valuable ideas about the psychological characteristics of humans and the factors affecting their development are found in the works of theorists and practitioners of medicine (primarily, in psychiatry) such as S. S. Korsakov and V. Kh. Kandinsky. Considerable contributions to the natural science approach to personality study were made by J. M. Setšenov, I. P. Pavlov, A. A. Ukhtomsky, and others.

The development of pedagogy-oriented conceptions of human psychology was stimulated by the need to solve certain concrete problems in education. A considerable contribution to the development of personality psychology was made by the pedagogical ideas advanced by K. D. Ušinsky and, particularly, by his book *Man as an Object of Education.* Pedagogically oriented studies of human psychology were also furthered by P. F. Kapterev.

Problems of personality kept a noticeable profile in the developmental history of psychology as science. They were tackled by outstanding psychologists such as M. E. Basov, K. N. Kornilov, A. F. Lazursky, N.

D. Levitov, P. F. Lesgaft, A. P. Netšayev, and V. S. Filatov, among others.

3.2 Basic Methodological Principles and General Trends in Soviet Psychological Studies of Personality

Studies of personality psychology are based on the following methodological principles: reflection, determinism, social and historical causality, development, the unity of consciousness, activity and personality, the unity of the objective and subjective, the unity of the social and individual, the unity of the biological and social, and the principles of a personality-oriented approach to psychic phenomena. The systemic-structural approach has also found wide application in the psychology of personality in recent years.

It should be noted that at present there is neither a single definition of personality accepted by all scholars nor a single concept of personality and its structure that would be shared by at least a majority of scientists. This comes to the attention of psychologists, philosophers, sociologists, and law specialists, as well as to scholars in other fields concerned with problems of personality. This situation is due to the diversity of characteristics of personality. On the one hand, it creates difficulties in developing a universal concept of personality structure, and solving this problem would be of tremendous theoretical and practical importance. On the other hand, it is contended that a universal theory of personality and its structure cannot be developed in principle, and should it be achieved, it would inevitably detract from the existing wealth of ideas and concepts on the subject.

"So far there is no definition of personality acceptable to representatives of various sciences" (Šorohova 1974, 22). This author accounts for this situation as well as for the lack of a generally accepted theory of personality structure "by the quality of on-going concrete psychological studies which does not allow one to offer a logical, precise, and well-substantiated description of personality structure which might have both theoretical, and methodological and applied importance" (Šorohova 1974, 31-32).

Still more categorical is the opinion of V. M. Bleikher and L. F. Burlatšuk that "the existing concepts of personality structure seem to

be invulnerable to any criticism because this criticism itself proceeds from another, not infrequently incomparable, approach to the problem rather than dealing with any concrete psychological evidence" (Bleikher & Burlatšuk 1978, 81). They believe this is particularly true with respect to the commentaries on K. K. Platonov's theory which Platonov included in one of his papers (Platonov 1986, 95-101).

Therefore, it may be inferred that while pursuing research in the problems of personality within the tennets of Marxist methodology, the authors of different theories of personality and personality structure place emphasis on different principles of methodology. Moreover, it is natural that they choose different processes, qualities, and mental states as the subject of their studies.

Prior to undertaking a more detailed analysis of the range of issues raised in the Soviet studies of personality and by concrete theories by authors representing different schools of psychological thought, it is important to outline some aspects of personality psychology and to identify certain general trends in the development of personality investigations.

E. V. Šorohova identifies the following six tendencies:

The first trend consist in that said studies are regarded as an indispensable component of the complex of the sciences dealing with investigations of man. "Psychology, as a whole, is a link between the social, natural, and technological sciences. This role predetermines both the methods and vistas of research as well as the range of application of knowledge on humans. Using the classification of the sciences by B. M. Kedrov, the classification pattern of J. Piaget, and the views of F. V. Konstantinov on the role played by psychology, B. G. Ananyev put forward stimulating ideas on this subject (3). B. G. Ananyev identifies areas of common ground in the overall structure of knowledge about man which establish connections between many of the sciences dealing with different forms of the existence and consciousness of human beings. Among these areas are: (a) the problem of man as a biological species; (b) studies of mankind: (c) the ontogenesis of a human being as an individual, and (d) studies of man as a person. Psychology makes its contributions to the development of and studies in each of these areas. A particular role is played by psychology in the system of sciences which deal with human personality. Personality is regarded as a unique and specific subject of psychological science. However, a description of personality cannot be adequate and complete unless the psychological

approach is employed in conjunction with other sciences" (Šorohova, 1980, 47).

The second basic trend in the development of present-day Soviet psychology consists in the working out of the rationable for a multi-aspect, systemic structural approach to personality and its implementation in empirical studies. This approach treats personality and its activity as a certain integral derivative of a multitude of interconnected characteristics and components rather than as a conglomerate of separate psychic processes and a combination of separate actions and operations. "Psychological phenomenon, be it a process state or quality of a person which manifests itself in activity and, therefore, activity itself or actions as its components, cannot be properly understood unless their being predetermined by personality as a whole is taken into consideration" (Platonov 1972, 116).

A third tendency of psychological studies of personality finds its expression in the consistent realization of the principle of unity of consciousness and activity which was suggested earlier and later modified and extended to meet the needs of personality psychology. Although paying lip service to this principle, some psychologists limited its application to the studies of an individual person. An action was studied as a unit of activity in terms of a "subject-to object" relationship. At present, the need to consider the other aspect of activity, namely, the socio-behavioral aspect or the "subject-to-subject" relationship is being realized. According to K. A. Abulhanova, the activity of an individual is related to that of other persons. In reality, it takes the form of cooperation and, as a result, it is always organized, i.e. it is conducted in accordance with the activities of other persons (Abulhanova, 1973). This cooperation involves constant interaction of individuals in social interaction. The latter is a component of the system of the person-activity relationship. There is a large body of empirical evidence concerning different patterns of social interaction in pre-school children, high school students, and adults, and on different areas and means of social interaction and relationships of mass and personal communication during interactions. These data, as well as evidence obtained in the studies of interpersonal relations in different social groups, pointed to the role and importance of social interaction in the formation of the psychic qualities of a person as well as its being, alongside activity, an indispensable factor which determines the fabric of personality psychology.

Whatever the methodological principle - the unity of consciousness and activity (S. L. Rubinštein) or the activity approach (A. N. Leontjev), representatives of many schools of Soviet psychological science agree on the interpretation of personality as an active factor. There is general consensus that the active nature of personality is its essential feature. However, the interpretation of this quality is characterized by a wide range of variation. In a sense, this variety characterizes the specificity of the solutions to the problem of the relationship between personality and activity (Šorohova 1980, 50-51).

The above trends in psychological investigations of personality delineate general theoretical and methodological approaches to the problem. They reflect the philosophical and general psychological characteristics of personality. However, apart from this, the psychological sciences distinguish personality as a specific subject of differential and social psychology. It may be claimed that the theory of differential psychology is based on an individual-oriented approach to personality whereas the social psychology theory of personality is based on a socio-psychological approach.

The individual-oriented approach to personality may be identified as the fourth tendency of psychological studies. In proceeding from this premise, Soviet scholars believe that the social being of humans takes both general and individual forms. The psyche, conditioned by its social environment, should be studied in the course of analysis of the social being of a concrete person.

The notion of personality used in psychology includes both the consciousness and activity of the individual. This idea was formulated clearly by Rubinštein: "All psychic phenomena in the totality of their relationships are part of a concrete living and acting human being; all of them are determined by the biological and social being of the individual" (Rubinštein 1973, 239). It is an objective of psychological studies of man to establish correlations between the biological and the social. The individual carrying on its essentially social activity may be studied both as a social phenomenon and as a source of individual potentialities. Concrete psychological investigations are generally concerned with correlations between social, psychological, and biological factors. These correlations are constantly present in the process of human activity (e.g. work or study) and social interaction. Such notions as "development of a person", "development of the body" and "development of the mind" are but scholarly abstractions which reflect the different aspects of one process characterized by numerous manifestations (Rubinštein 1973, 79).

Specifically, the individual approach to studies of personality is regarded by psychologists, in particular, as a problem of relationships between the personality and other psychic phenomena. There is a tradition in Soviet psychology of tracing the dialectical ties between the personality and mental processes. All psychic manifestations - processes, functions, qualities, and states - as well as their substance, dynamics, and course of development, are directly determined by the concrete activity of a concrete person. The use of the concept of personality provides a means of accounting for the general psychological regularities of formation and development of mental phenomena on the basis of the real existence of a human being as a material entity involved in relationships with the world. Psychic functions do not exist by themselves: their development is determined by the general processes of the development of a person. Since an individual develops and his/her/personality forms by interacting with environment in which the person carries on activity to achieve certain objectives and which is changed as a result of this activity, activity is the main factor governing the development of an individual's inner world. Therefore manifestations of each psychic quality are of paramount importance.

Psychic processes depend on the development of personality and, in turn, determine a person's behavior - they regulate its activity. "...Psychic phenomena are organically interwoven into the fabric of a person's life since the chief vital function of all psychic phenomena and processes consists in the regulation of human activity. Being conditioned by external stimuli (resulting from the interaction of an individual with environment in the course of activity), psychic processes determine behavior, thus ensuring the dependence of behavior on real world conditions" (Rubinštein 1957, 307).

"Any human response and the whole system of emotional and intellectual processes are functions of those peculiarities of a personality which have formed in the course of its social development. There is abundant empirical evidence on the dependence of the course of separate psychic processes on the needs and motives which stimulate the development of these processes" (Šorohova 1980,53-54).

The social psychological orientation is the fifth direction of on-going psychological studies of the personality. "Socio-psychological investigations of personality as a specific branch of psychology include studies of the social determination of the psychic make-up of a person; social motivation of behavior and activity under various socio-historical and -psychological conditions; class, ethnicity, and

occupational characteristics; mechanisms of formation and realization of social activity; pathways and means of stimulating this activity; social status; the system of values; problems of inner conflicts development and ways of their resolution; self-education and mechanisms of individual psychological make-up formation in the environment of a given socio-historical order" (Šorohova 1980, 54).

Against the background of the above said a sixth tendency of Soviet psychological studies stands out, namely, their practical orientation. It consists primarily of investigating the factors moulding a child's personality, his behavior, moral consciousness, values, interests, and attitudes. The objective of such studies is to uncover the mechanisms underlying the child's psychological formation and the psychological aspects of his education.

"The successful solution of the practical problems of personality development may be assured by analysis of the child's life and activity conditions, formation of his lifestyle, and psychological pattern of personality. It should be noted that such an approach is not merely confined to identification of the peculiar features of this pattern. Rather, Soviet researchers tend to mould these features. The pedagogical and didactic methods of teaching and education are based on the psychological concepts of personality. It should be mentioned that practice-oriented research uses suitable methods; the psychological-pedagogical transformation experiment being one of the major procedures used in this area" (Šorohova 1980, 54).

According to E. V. Šorohova, identification of the mechanisms of changes and moulding of individual consciousness as a consequence of living under certain social and historical conditions will remain a major objective of psychological research in problems of personality.

"It should be borne in mind that human behavior and consciousness are governed by common laws and mechanisms and the latter actually are realizations of the former under given historical conditions. Therefore, personality design, identification of the mechanisms of personality moulding in the collective context, and transformation of external stimuli into means of internal control are becoming factors of paramount importance" (Šorohova 1980, 55).

3.3 Objectives of Psychology in Personality Psychology

E. V. Šorohova suggests that all objectives in personality psychology research may be divided into eight groups:

(1) The Problems of General Theory and Methodology of Personality Psychology. They deal with the application of Marxist theory to personality in psychological studies, the critical assessment of non-Marxist unscientific views on the problems of personality, the systematization, classification, and improvement of principles of methods development, and the working out of a system of categories and notions to be used in personality studies (Šorohova 1980, 55). It should be mentioned here that existing attitudes towards so-called "non-Marxist and bourgeois" theories of personality are being reviewed radically, with attempts being undertaken to make use of all that is constructive and useful in these theories. Researchers are scrapping the purely dogmatic Marxist approach to studies of personality and withhold ungrounded criticism of non-Marxist views on the problem.

(2) Still urgent are the problems of the description of personality as a product of social development, its dependence on concrete social and historical context, and the role of a person in a given social environment. They imply the implementation of the Marxist view of the individual as a reflection and embodiment of social relationships. Scholars turn to these problems whenever they are faced with the need to give an outline of the historical development of personality psychology, particularly, in different social and historical contexts (Šorohova 1980, 55).

One may expect considerable changes and more research on the problem of social relationships to be carried out to meet the challenge of on-going changes and transformations in the social, political, and economic life of Soviet society. These changes will be called - for due to the role of Marxist-Leninist philosophy in the development of the content and methods used in psychology research being reconsidered.

(3) The need to identify the mechanisms of personality moulding in a society of developed socialism stems logically from tackling the above problems. The need to study the psychological effects of the elim-

ination of the contrasts between manual and mental work and the formation of preconditions for the harmoniously-balanced development of a person provides an illustration. Among other examples are the analysis of the formation of the needs and values of an individual, psychological aspects of the processes of development of communistic attitudes towards labor, collectivistic spirit, patriotism and internationalism, and an all-round development of the abilities and creative potential of the individual (Šorohova 1980, 55).

The following developments and changes taking place in the Soviet Union should be viewed as important corrections to be taken into account when considering what was said above: the discarding of the notion of "developed socialism", the refusal to use socialist and, particularly, communist ideology in dealing with economic, social, and political problems facing Soviet society, the transformation of Soviet society itself into a commonwealth of independent sovereign republics, the secession of some of them (the Baltic republics), the attempts to introduce a market economy, the ethnic conflicts, the growing national self-awareness and nationalistic tendencies that call for a radical re-evaluation of the problems of this group, and the shift in emphasis, and a re-definition of the problems and directions of research. On the whole, the tenor of the relevant objectives may be formulated as the need to research the mechanisms of personality moulding during perestroika as well as before and after this period. However, still to come are studies of the nature of the processes of personality formation, existence, and development during the periods now referred to as Lenin's or Stalin's era, Hruštšev's "thaw", and Brežnev's period of "stagnation".

(4) The complex of problems dealing with the ontogenetic development of man will continue to be an area of specific interest for Soviet psychologists. In the analysis of the ontogenesis of personality, it is essential that the conditions and factors of normal and twisted personality-development, the psychological aspects of re-education, and the individual's life be studied and followed.

(5) Investigations of the biological fundamentals of personality form the fifth group of problems. They deal with the genotypic and phenotypic characteristics of man, the role of somatic features, the constitution, and the typologic characteristics of cerebral activity.

(6) These problems are close to the domain of the differential psychology of personality which explores the individual features of character in their complex relationships with biological traits, specific

conditions of development, dominant patterns of social behavior, and the mould of the personality. Studies of the psycho-physiological bases of individual differences feature prominently among these problems (Šorohova 1980, 55-56).

(7) The traditional problems of the psychological aspects of personality and the mechanisms of their development still attract and will continue to draw the attention of researchers. Among them are the problems of the structural hierarchy of personality and the cognitive, semantic, and emotional components and values of personality; the role of consciousness and self-awareness, activity, and social interaction in personality moulding processes, and the relationship between psychic processes and the peculiar traits of a personality.

(8) Finally, a batch of problems dealing with the techniques used in personality investigations. In his time, J. P. Pavlov identified method as the driving force of science. The psychology of personality is no exception in this respect. The development of effective methods for studies of personality and diagnosing its special features is a prerequisite for the solution of theoretical and practical problems.

3.4 The General Concept of Personality

The second edition of the *Dictionary of the Living Great Russian Language* (1881) compiled by V. I. Dal does not contain the word personality as a separate entry. The entry for "face" reads as follows: "the frontal part of the human head, extending from the hair line down to the ears and the bottom edge of the cheek-bone: the forehead, the eyes, the nose, the cheeks with the cheek-bones, the lips and the tip of the chin".

"Personality" - a person, an independent, separate being - is entered as one of the derivatives. At the time a different word, "soul", was used to denote reason, will, and the "living being of man thought of as separate from the body and spirit".

Fifteen years later, F. A. Brockhouse and I. A. Efron's Encyclopedic Dictionary (1896) contained a page for the entry: "Personality - internal definition of a single being in its independence, as having reason, will, and peculiar character, and characterized by a unity of self-awareness ... In principle, the human personality has natural dignity which predetermines its inalienable rights which are being recognizied as progress develops..."

The Encyclopedic Dictionary published by "Brothers Grant and Company" another 20 years later contained an entry for "personality" but no definition. Instead, it referred the reader to "individualism". Individualism, in turn, was defined, as a "social view which upholds the right of a person to self-determination by setting its autonomous value as different from that of any collective body..." It seems to be a source of the opposition between the individual and collective, between the personal and the social. Later on, this gave rise to a certain approach to both the problem of personality in general and that of the priority of the social over the individual, which has persisted in Soviet social theories, psychology, public consciousness, and social practice.

In 1938, the entry was included in the first edition of the Soviet Encyclopedia (ed. 1937) and occupied seven pages of small print text. It featured problems such as the role of personality in socialist society and in history, the emergence of personalities, and the role of world leaders' and distinguished individuals' personality in history. The definition of personality read as follows: "The personality is a historical category: a personality is a human being who has passed

through the animal stage and undergoes development in human society. By participating in such specifically human activity as work, man has ceased to be an animal, has developed his individual personal qualities and traits, consciousness, and self-awareness, in short, his personality."

A more recent edition of the Soviet Encyclopedia (1954, Vol. 25) gives the following definition: "A personality is a human being living in society, and the subject of cognition and active transformation of the world. Personality can be identified with man only, as having reason and the abilities to speak and to work ... The spiritual make-up of a person is a historically-conditioned combination of such essential and relatively common and stable psychic qualities as character, temperament, abilities, talents, dispositions, and interests."

The recent changes in the notions of personality over the past nearly one hundred years are recorded in the 1973 edition of the same encyclopedia (Vol. 14). This word regarded as a common word and a term is used to denote:

(1) "A human individual as a subject of relationships and cognitive activity - a person in the wide sense; (2) a stable system of socially significant traits which characterize an individual as a member of a society or community ... a person, as a whole human being (lat.-persona), and personality, as its social and psychological make-up, are different terms which, however, are sometimes used as synonyms" in the latter narrower sense, in special texts. It is also recommended to distinguish between "personality" and an "individual" - a human being as a singular representative of a biological or social whole - and "individuality" - a totality of traits by which a given person is distinguished from other people. While the notion of individuality is relevant at lower levels such as the biochemical and neurophysiological, "personality does not emerge until consciousness and self-awareness have developed, and it is from this viewpoint that it is studied by philosophy, psychology, and sociology" (Serov 1989, 24-25).

The Psychological Dictionary (1983, 178-179) defines personality as follows: "Personality is a term denoting (1) a human individual as a subject of relationships and cognitive activity, or (2) a stable system of socially significant traits which characterize and individual as a member of a society or community. Personality does not emerge until consciousness and self-awareness have developed ... General psychology treats personality as a kind of nucleus, an integrating

element around which different psychic processes are associated and thus determine the line and stability of an individual's behavior."

Finally, another working definition can be used: "A personality is a concrete integral human individual endowed with consciousness and regarded as the subject and object of social activity whose qualities are determined by the concrete historical conditions of society, and who is considered in the totality of his biological and social humane qualities (sometimes anti-social and inhumane) with due account of changes which these qualities undergo during and individual's life-time" (Serov 1989, 32).

Personality has a number of common characteristics which give due to this notion, such as its active nature, consciousness, time-dependence, integrity, stability, orientation, and unity of the social and individual.

3.5 Active Nature of Personality

The above definitions indicate an interpretation of personality as a person endowed with consciousness. However, since "human consciousness both reflects and reshapes the real world (Lenin 1960), active nature is an attribute of personality, while activity is its major function and at the same time, the form of its most explicit manifestation. In the final analysis, the active nature of a personality manifests itself in the persistence of a person's orientation to carry out a specific kind of activity, and this trait will feature in one's character.

The active nature of personality implies motivation and stimulation to bring about socially-significant changes in the environment and, specifically, in daily interaction, social activity, and creative work. The active character of personality is reflected in its most general and integrated trait, namely the taking of an active stand on life issues which, in turn, is revealed in adherence to principles, consistency in upholding one's views, and integrity of character.

The active nature of personality stimulates interaction with environment, extension of the range of activity, as well as determination to go beyond the boundaries of stereotype situations and social roles (motivation for achievement, risk taking, etc.).

Among the most significant manifestations of the active stand is social and practical "hyperactivity". It is a form of suprasituational activity which tends to go beyond the prescribed limits of a particular kind of activity. Hyperactivity is hard to identify unless officially approved norms exist. At the same time, by engaging in such hyperactivity, a person crosses the external and internal "barriers" involved. Suprasituational activity takes the form of creative work, cognitive (intellectual) activity, higher than expected performance, and "interest-free" risk taking.

Several levels of personal activity can be identified using different criteria. Biological and social activities are among those which are traditionally identified and most widespread. Biological activity is understood to be conditioned by the peculiarities of a person's psychophysiological make-up and other biological requirements. However, social activity is a function of the fulfillment (or non-fulfillment) of social requirements. Biological activity is aimed at meeting the needs preserving and sustaining the likes of the person and his or her offspring. Social activity is concerned with satisfying needs of a higher order, namely, those determined by spiritual, cultural, and social factors. Such activity is not limited to providing the means of subsistence, it provides opportunities to gain a certain social status, to realize innate qualities, to fulfill certain social tasks, and to achieve concrete social objectives in the course of interaction with other individuals.

Levels of activity are also identifiable with regard to the source of regulation. In this sense, at the lower level, activity is stimulated, directed, and controlled by external environmental stimuli - other people or circumstances. Accordingly, a higher level of activity consists in self-regulation. Therefore, both personality development and the rate and range of activity are inseparable from the development of personality mechanisms of self-control. As a result, both the development of personality and manifestations of its activity are linked with the development of its regulatory processes and mechanisms. External environmental stimuli cause the personality to depend on their trivia, whims of individual people, and unpredictable developments. They leave it to the person to carry out activity in a given direction at a pre-determined rate. These stimuli predetermine the beginning, course, and termination of a person's activity. As processes of self-regulation develop, they provide a person with the means of implementing conscientious choices; its activity comes to depend on internal reasons alone, which in turn, are formulated by the person in accordance with its peculiarities and needs.

Academician I. P. Pavlov maintained that man is a self-regulating, self-adjusting and even self-improving system. This view contradicts the mechanistic concept of the personality as being manipulated by fate and external environmental factors. It has already become commonplace to state that personality is conditioned by society. However, similarly frequent are statements about the active character of personality. A personality is a product of circumstances, the latter being produced by people. Therefore, one may say that the circle has been closed.

A person's activity is characterized by a hierarchy of goals due to exercising control over cognitive and practical processes, and it is through self-control that activity is carried out in a hierarchy-based, systematic, and purposeful manner. Since a person faces choices, he or she does not shift from one kind of activity or intercourse to another automatically. Each decision is made consciously, with an awareness of its social and personal significance, the situation in question and possible consequenses.

"Self-control at the top level is carried out by a special 'I' system which represents a person's self-awareness. The notion of the 'I' forms the focus of self-awareness in the course of one's life and education ... Education and the life style of the child and adult mould an 'I' and its potential for self-control of its own means and resources. As a result, there are people who think of themselves as: 'I can do anything', 'I can do much', 'I can't do anything', 'I can do something'. The opinion one holds about one's own 'I' sets the limits of ambition as well as the matching level of activity and the extent of ability development ... An 'I' as a system of self-control starts to develop in the child in response to comments made by adults in his environment and as a result of realizing his own abilities. Once established, the system may remain unchanged for the rest of one's life and generally it cannot be altered unless subjected to sometimes powerful, sometimes weak, but invariably long-term pressure, particularly from people of authority. Of course, once one has become aware of one's potentialities, it is reasonable to suggest that the system of self-evaluation can be modified without external influence ... Self-control comes to flourish in mature age when the available knowledge has already stood the tests of life and the personality itself has reached the prime of its capabilities and has gone through numerous trials" (Bogôlovski 1981, 74).

The functions of the personality as a self-regulatory system are as follows:

(1) to call for or delay an action;
(2) to switch to different types of psychic activity;
(3) to accelerate or slow psychic activity down;
(4) to increase or reduce the rate of activity;
(5) to coordinate motives;
(6) to control activity by making sure that actions match the original plan, and
(7) to coordinate actions.

To fulfill these objectives, the 'I' system operates through the following basic mechanisms: (1) control, (2) coordination, (3) sanctioning, and (4) intensification. Control is effected through continuous awareness of what is going on in internal and external environments ... With the system of self-control functioning, the entire mental activity becomes subordinated to the carrying-out of a specific program. Coordination is an extremely important function of the 'I' ... According to I. P. Pavlov, this process consists in comparing motives to the real conditions and moral values. Coordination seems to be a function of thinking. Coordination is followed by sanctioning in the form of approval of the intention and the scheme of action. There may be different motives behind sanctions depending on an individual's education - they may be based on selfishness or softy moral principles ... many psychologists, A. F. Lazursky and M. A. Basov among them, have placed a lot of emphasis on will and effort. Indeed, any kind of mental activity - apprehension or thinking - requires an effort the magnitude of which is in direct correlation with the complexity of the activity. Effort is proportional to increasing difficulties and obstacles arising on the way to achieving the goal. Making an effort is particularly needed when a person lacks determination or is tired or depressed (Bogôlovski 1981, 75).

Thus, to effect self-control, the functioning of the 'I' system as the center of self-awareness chiefly involves will and thinking, i. e. cognition and action, both internal and external.

The 'I' structure includes: (1) the concept of what the 'I' is and what it should be ideally, and (2) a conscience which, in morally mature individuals, generally causes behavior to match the ideals. Whenever this does not happen, the individual is likely to "suffer remorse" and to alter his or her behavior. When balance between behavior and ideals is maintained, it is accompanied by the feeling of "quiet or

clear conscience" which is a factor securing proper behavior (Bogôlovski 1981, 76).

Tentatively, two modes of self-control may be distinguished: short-term and long-term. Also, there are the following types of self-control:

(1) The moral strong-willed type is a personality characterized by integrity in the full sense of the word;

(2) The immoral strong-willed type represents an individualistic personality intent on pursuing selfish ends, but it is reasonable and has integrity;

(3) The aboulic weak-willed type occurs in passive, spiritless, and indifferent individuals;

(4) The impulsive type characterizes people who make rash decisions and act on impulse.

Accordingly, self-control is more effective in the former two types and less effective in the latter two.

Another factor in activity development is the range of perspective, i. e. the "extrapolation of oneself into the future". There is a direct correlation between the rate and level of activity and the range of perspective - achieving relatively remote and more significant objectives generally requires higher activity.

What are the mechanisms for carrying on activity? There are at least three approaches to the solution of this problem: biological, sociological, and dialectical materialistic.

There are several biological theories of man, his mentality, and personality. For instance, there have been attempts to account for human activity through the operation of hereditary genetic mechanisms alone. Another view is based on the similarity of the nervous system in humans and animals. As a result, it is believed that the social behavior of individuals can be controlled through electrophysiological manipulations of nervous system functions. Other scholars pin their hopes on the effects of biochemicals and gene engineering for correction of behavior and explaining the mechanism underlying the activity of the individual. Still others consider the

genetic pool of the population to be a factor which sets limits on individual activity and its manifestation.

This approach is fully based on the biological factors of personality development, heredity being the main one. The qualities and other characteristics of a personality are described as inalienably associated with heredity while environment is seen as nothing else but a "regulator", an "indicator", or a constant factor which interacts with heredity, a factor of variability and a source of unlimited possibilities.

The sociological vision of a human being as "a concentrated embodiment of economy, culture, or "socium" is completely devoid of any biological, organic, or physical associations. Such a view leads to an idealistic interpretation of mental phenomena which sees them outside any connection with a material substrate, and considers individual consciousness as a sort of derivative from the interaction of individual consciousness or abstract culture" (Lomov 1984, 348). Accordingly, personality development should be seen as being inextricably linked with environment. Therefore, to study personality is to investigate the structure of its environment. Environment determines an individual's personality, behavior mechanisms, and the directions of development once and for all (Petrovsky 1979, 9). Like the proponents of the purely biological approach who deny the person's control of activity by attributing behavior and development to the realization of genetic predispositions, the sociology-oriented scholars do practically the same by tracing all phenomena to the causes in the social environment. Personality activity is reduced, in this case, to the response to and processing of outside stimuli.

As a consequence, it remains unclear why totally different personalities develop in the same environment, while personalities with similar innate traits, values, and behavior emerge in different social environments.

In the 1920's and 1930's, L. S. Vygotsky worked out a theory of the development of higher psychic functions. He maintained that human psychology is a combination of interiorized social relationships which become functions of a personality and forms of its structure. Unlike traditional psychological science which traced social behavior to the individual, L. S. Vygotsky demonstrated that higher psychic functions could originate in a society in the form of interpersonal relationships and become personalized at a later stage ... a personality emerges in what it presents to others (Petrovsky 1973, 14-15).

Soviet psychologists proceed from the assumption that a personality displays its activity in its interaction with the environment. Sources of its activity should be traced to its needs, since they induce a particular kind of behavior. A need is a condition related to the dependence of a person on the concrete conditions of life. Need is the source of activity ... Activity manifests itself in satisfying the needs of an individual.

The dialectical materialistic approach to the problem of personality development points to the identification of internal contradictions in a personality. Solution of conflicts caused by them opens the way for development from the simple to the complex, from the lowest to the highest. Personal activity is conditioned by complexes of needs through a maze of conscious and subconscious motives. However, satisfaction of needs involves internal conflicts because they rarely take place immediately and in full measure. This fact calls for the provosion of certain means such as readiness to act, knowledge, skills, etc. The conflict between development of needs and the availability of suitable means is reproduced again and again. Therefore, it may be concluded that the "driving forces involved in the mental development of a person are displayed in the conflicts between the person's changing needs and the available means for their satisfaction" (Vygotsky 1977, 131).

3.6 Personality and Consciousness

The attitudes of a mature personality are essentially conscientious. "Consciousness is ... an integral characteristic of a personality, which, however, does not necessarily imply one and the same relationship between the conscious and subconscious in realizing any attitude.

The degree of the social, moral, and ideological maturity of a person is determined by the conscientiousness of its attitudes; it is closely associated with sense of responsibility to society. In final analysis, the stand of a person as the social subject is revealed in whether its social involvements are intentional or spontaneous. Unfortunately, the importance of the problem of consciousness is still underestimated" (Lomov 1984, 334-335).

3.7 Time-Related Nature of Personality

The nature of personality cannot be understood outside its relations to society. Social relationships emerge on the basis of certain modes of production and productive forces. Essentially, the mode of production determines the social order, family patterns, social groups and classes, the political structure, and different forms of social consciousness, i. e. the entire structure of society, as well as the mode of life of individual members of a given society (Lomov 1984, 296). The activity and inter-relationships of individuals take place within the constraints of the existing social context which prescribe the rights and responsibilities of an individual, determine the individual's social status, set of social roles, the formation, development, and manifestation of needs, motives, aspirations, interests, values, emotions and abilities.

"In order to understand the sources of a person's qualities and characteristics, it is necessary to follow the person's life and progress in society. Social relationships of an individual find their expression in the type of communities he or she joins as well as in the type of reasons behind his or her decisions to participate in a given activity. Eventually, individual personal qualities are formed and develop depending on class, national and ethnic affiliations, occupation, historical pattern of the family, education, and social or political organization membership, etc." (Lomov 1984, 298).

The peculiar features of the social life and lifestyle of an individual depend on participating in the activities of a community or communities, the historical context in which the individual is born, forms, and develops. They are ultimately determined by the nature of the prevalent social and economic order. In a sense, personality is a reflection of the historical conditions of a person's life and development. Different periods of development of a society find their reflection in different types of personality. These differences are portrayed in fiction books, films, science literature, text books, dictionaries and reference books, works of art and sculpture, and in officialese and colloquial speech and folklore. They find their expression in personality types such as the "heroes" of the 20's, the 30's (Komsomol-run construction projects), the 40's (building up the army and heavy industries), the 50's (rebuilding the economy, cultivation of virgin lands), the 60's (the first flight in outer space, achievements in art and science) revival of the self-awareness of a free person, shaking off the mentality of the Stalin cult era), the 70's (rule of

officialdom, stagnation, social indifference, consumerism and dissidents), 1980-1985 (deepening crisis, growing conflicts in social consciousness), 1985-1990 (emergence of a new democracy, shedding off the ideological bonds, polarization of society in economic, cultural and ethnic life).

Analysis of the types of personality that occur in the context of different periods of social history is still to be undertaken, but it is obvious even now that it will yield numerous valuable findings on the changes taking place in the concept of the personality and tendencies in the formation and development of its qualities and substructures.

There is no doubt that historical context must not and cannot account for all the specific behaviors, motives, and values of the individual. Being an individual, each person is characterized by his or her own specific innate features, which, in turn, fit into the mould of a given historical type of personality. This relationship goes along with the existence of different time-related types of personality characterized by their own specific features. Therefore, although a personality is not a mere reflection of its historical context, the latter is contained in it and displayed in specific personal features and characteristics.

By means of a feed-back mechanism, the time-related nature of personality is displayed in each individual person and the totality of individuals creating the history of their time and its image. In other words, personality is history-related both as the object and subject of historical changes, the socio-political structure, and social relationships.

The personality is a hierarchy of relationships, those representing major needs and interests being at the top. They form the "nucleus" which influences all other relationships of an individual, the nature of their manifestation, their stability, and other qualities.

REFERENCES

Abulhanova, K. A. 1973. On the Subject of Psychic Activity. Moscow.

Abulhanova-Slavskaja, K. A. 1980. Dejatelnost i psihologija litšnosti. Moskva: Nauka.

Abulhanova-Slavskaja, K. A. 1981. Razvitie litšnosti v protsess žižnedejatelnosti. In Psihologija formirovanija i razvitija litšnosti. Moskva: Nauka.

Amonashvili, S. A. 1990. Litšnostno - gumannaja osnova pedagogitšeskovo protsessa. Minsk.

Ananyev, B. G. 1968. Tselovek kak predmet poznanija. Leningrad: LGU.

Ananyev, B. G. 1977. O problemah sovremennovo tšelovekoznanija. Moskva: Nauka.

Ananyev, B. G. 1980. Izbrannye psihologitšeskie trudi. Vol. I. Pedagogika. Moskva: Pedagogika.

Andrejeva, G. M. 1980. Sotsialnaja psihologija. Moskva: MGU.

Antsiferova, L. I. 1981. K psihologi litšnosti kak razvivajuštšeisja sistemy. Psihologija formirovanija i razviti litšnosti. Moskva: Nauka.

Artemjeva, T. I. 1977. Metodologitšeškii aspekt problemy sposobnostei. Moskva: Nauka.

Asejev, B. G. 1976. Motivatsija povedenija i formirovanie litšnosti. Moskva: Mysl.

Asejev, B. G. 1981. Edinstvo soderzatelnoi i dinamitšeskoi storon litšnosti v vospitatelnom protsesse. Psihologija formirovanija i razvitija litšnosti. Moskva: Nauka.

Berezovin, N. A. & J. L. Kolominsky. 1975. Utšitel i detskii kollektiv: Psihologo - pedagogitšeskoe issledovanie. Minsk: BGU.

Bleikher, V. M. & L. F. Burlatšuk. 1978. Psihologitšeskaja diagnostika intellekta i litšnosti. Kiev: Višha škola.

Bodalev, A. A. 1963. O ponimanii školnika vospitateljami i proektirovanii imi evo litšnosti. V cbornike: Tezisy dokladov na II Sjezde Obštšestva psihologov SSSR. Moskva: Nauka.

Bodalev, A. A. 1965. Vosprijatie tšeloveka tšelovekom. Leningrad: LGU.

Bodalev, A. A. 1968. Predstavlenie o školnike i ponjatie o ev litšnosti u evo sverstnikov i utsitelei. Utšenie zapiski Leningradskovo universiteta. Leningrad: LGU.

Bodalev, A. A. 1970. Formirovanie ponjatija o drugom tšeloveke kak litšnosti. Leningrad: LGU.

Bodalev, A. A. 1980. Formirovanie litšnosti - aktualnaja problema kompleksnovo psihologo-pedagogitšeskovo issledovanija. Moskva: MGU.

Bodalev, A. A. 1980. O razrabotke psihologi poznanija ljudmi drug druga. Psihologitšeski žurnal, Vol. I, NI, 21-29. Moskva: MGU.

Bodalev, A. A. 1982. Vosprijatie i ponimanie tšeloveka tšelovekom. Moskva: MGU.

Bodalev, A. A. 1983. Litšnost i obštšhenie. Izbrannie trudij. Moskva: Pedagogika.

Bodalev, A. A. 1988. Psihologija o litšnosti. Moskva: MGU.

Bogdanov, B. A. 1983. Sotsialno - psihologitšeskie svoistva litšnosti: Utšebnoe posobie. Leningrad: LGU.

Bogdanov, B. A. 1987. Sistemologitšeskoe modelirovanie litšnosti v sotsialnoi psihologii. Leningrad: LGU.

Bogôlovski, V. V. 1976. Mežhlitšnostnie otnošenija v strukture pedagogitšeskoi dejatelnosti utšitelja. Psihologija truda i litšnosti utšitelja. Leningrad: LGU.

Bogôlovsky V. V. (Ed.) 1981. Obštšaja Psihologija. Moskva: Prosveštšenie.

Božovitš, L. I. 1960. Izutšenie litšnosti školnika i problemy vospitanija. Psihologitšeskaja nauka v SSSR. Moskva: APN.

Božovitš, L. I. 1968. Litšnostj i evo formirovanie v detskom vozraste. Moskava: Prosveštšenie.

Božovitš, L. I. 1972. Izutšenie litšnosti i formirovanie v ontogeneze. Problema upravlenija protsessom formirovanija litšnosti. Moskva: Nauka.

Božovitš, L. I. 1972. Psihologitšeskie osobennosti litšnosti starševo školnika. Komsomol v škole. Moskva: MGU.

Božovitš, L. I. 1981. Psihologitšeskii analiz uslovii formirovanija i stroenija garmonitšeskoi litšnosti. Psihologija formirovanija i razvitija litšnosti. Moskva: Nauka.

Bueva, L. P. 1971. Sotsialnaja sreda i formirovanie garmonitšeskoi litšnosti. Moskva: Prosveštšenie.

Dal, V. I. (ed.) 1881. Dictionary of the Living Great Russian Language. Moscow.

Demin, M. B. 1977. Problemy teorii litšnosti. Moskva: Prosveštšenie.

Dodonov, B. I. 1978. Emotsija kak tsennost. Moskva: Politizdat.

Dodonov, B. I. 1981. Garmonitšeskoe razvitie i tipologitšeskoe svoeobrazie litšnosti. Problemi psihologii litšnosti. Psihologija formirovanija i razvitija litšnosti. Moskva: Nauka.

Dodonov, B. I. 1982. Problema sootnošenija dejatelnosti i emotsionalnyh harakteristik litšnosti. Problemy psihologii litšnosti: Sovatsko - finskii simpozium. Moskva: Nauka.

Dontsov, I. A. 1984. Samovospitanie litšnosti. Moskva: Politizdat.

Formirovanie litšnosti v perehodny period ot podrostkovo k junošeskomy vozrastu. 1987. Moskva: Pedagogika, 184.

Galimova, T. G. 1977. Dinamika mezlitšnostnih otnošenii v utšebnoi gruppe. Teoretitšeskie i prikladnie issledovanija po psihologii. Kazan.

Galperin, P. J. 1976. Vvedenie v pshihologiju. Moskva: Nauka.

Galuzinski, V. M. 1975. Nekotorie problemy metodologii i metodiki diagnostiki-prognostiki formirovanija litšnosti školniki. Kiev.

Gilbuz, J. Z. 1978. O katšestve otsenok utšiteljam psihitšeskih svoistv staršeklassnikov. Novye issledovanija psihologii. Moskva: Nauka.

Gonobilin, F. N. 1962. Psihologitšeskii analiz pedagogitšeskih sposobnostei. Sposobnosti i interesi. Moskva: Nauka.

Gonobilin, F. N. 1965. Kniga ob utšitele. Moskva: Prosveštšenie.

Gonobilin, F. N. 1975. O nekotorih psihitšeskih katšestvah litšnosti utšitelja. Voprosi psihologii. N 1. Moskva.

Gorbatševits, L. B. 1982. Problema litšnosti v sovremennoi filologitšeskoi i psihologitšeskoi literature. Teorija litšnosti. Leningrad: LGU.

Granovskaja, L. N. 1974. Vozrastnye preobrazovanija mežfunktsi nalnyh struktur vzroslyh ot 18 do 25 let. Sovremennye psihologo-pedagogitšeskie problemy vyšhei školy. Leningrad: LGU.

Jadov, V. A. 1969. Litšnostj i massovye kommunikatsii. Materialy vstretšhi sotsiologov. Tartu.

Jadov, V. A. 1975. O dispozitsionnoi reguljatsii sotsialnovo povedenija litšnosti. Metodlogitšeskie problemi sotsialnoi psihologii. Moskva: Nauka.

Jadov, V. A. 1987. Sotsiologitšeskoe issledovanie: metodologija, programma, metodi. Moskva: Nauka.

Jakunin, V. A. 1977. Razlitšija v individualno - psihologitšeskih harakteristikah litšnosti studentov s protivopoloznim sotsialno-psihologitšeskim statusom v gruppe. Psihologija-proizvodstvu i vospitaniju. Leningrad: LGU.

Jeroshenko, A. A. 1979. Tezisy doklada II Vsesojuznoi konferentsii v Krasnodare 31 maja - 2 ijunja 1979 goda. Krasnodar: N I I Psihologii.

Jershova, L. D. 1977. Osobennosti pertseptivnyh sposobnostei utšitelja. Psihologija truda i litšnosti utšitelj. Leningrad: LGPJ.

Kant, I. 1965. Metafizika nravov v dvyh tšastjah. Sobr. Sotšhesti tomah. Moskva: Mysl.

Kemerov, B. E. 1977. Problema litšnosti: metodologija issledovanija i žiznenni smysl. Moskva: Politizdat.

Kolesov, D. V. & I. F. Mjagkov. 1986. Utšitelju o psihologi i fiziologi podrostka. Moskva: Prosveštšenie.

Kolominsky, J. L. 1969. Psihologija litšnih vzaimootnošenii v detskom kollektive. Minsk.

Kolominsky, J. L. 1976. Psihologija vzaimootnošenii v malyh gruppah: Obštšie i vozrastnye osobennosti. Minsk.

Kolominsky, J. L. & N. A. Berezovin. 1975. Eksperimentalnoe issledovanie sotsialno - psihologitšeskoi nabludatelnosti utšitelei. Teoretitšeskie i prikladnie problemi psihologii poznanija ljudmi drug druga. Krasnodar: Kubanski universitet.

Kolominsky, J. L. & S. B. Voroshilova. 1975. Sotsialno - psihologitšeskaja nabludatelnost v sisteme pedagogitšeskih sposobnostei. Teoretitšeskie i prikladnye problemi psihologii poznanija ljudmi drug druga. Krasnodar.

Kon, I. S. 1967. Sotsiologija litšnosti. Moskva: Politizdat.

Kon, I. S. 1978. Otkritie "Ja". Moskva: Politizdat.

Kon, I. S. 1979. Psihologija junošheskovo vozrasta. Moskva: Prosveštšenie.

Kondratjeva, C. V. 1980. Ponimanie utšitelem litšnosti utšaštševosja. Voprosi psihologi. N 5. Moskva.

Kondratjeva, C. V. 1981. Psihologo - pedagogitšeskie aspekti problemi ponimanija ljudmi drug druga. Moskva: APN SSSR.

Kondratjeva, C. V. & I. A. Rapoport. 1975. O sotsialno - psihologitšeskoi sovmestimosti utšitelja i utšaštšihsja. N 7. Moskva: Sovetskaja Pedagogika.

Kondratjeva, C. V. & V. M. Razdobudko. 1975. K voprosu o ponimanii utšitelem litšnosti utsaštševosja. Teoretitšeskie i prikladnie problemy psihologii poznanija ljudmi drug druga. Krasnodar.

Kovalev, A. G. 1970. Psihologija litšnosti. Moskva: Prosveštšenie.

Kovalev, A. G. 1978. O vospitanii pedagogitšeskoi nabljudatelnosti u buduštših utšitelei. Psihologija vozrastnyh kollektivov. Kostroma.

Kratki slovarj po philosophii. 1979. Moskva: Politizdat.

Kratki psihologitšeski slovarj. 1985. Moskva: Politizdat.

Kuleshova, L. N. 1975. O vlijanii opyta pedagogitšeskoi raboty utšitelja na poznanie utšenika. Krasnodar.

Kuleshova, L. N. 1976. Nekotorye osobennosti poznanija utšitelem utšenika v protsesse obutšenija. Psihologija truda i litšnosti utšitelja. Leningrad: LGPJ.

Kutsenko, B. G. 1979. Puti samosoveršenstvovanija litšnosti Leningrad: Znanie.

Kuzmina, N. V. 1967. Otšerki psihologii truda utšitelja. Leningrad: LGU.

Kuzmina, N. V. 1972. Osnovi vuzovskoi pedagogiki. Leningrad: LGU.

Kuzmina, N. V. 1973. Osobennosti kommunikativnoi dejatelnosti pedagoga. Obštšenie kak predmet teoretitšeskih i prikladnyh issledovanii. Leningrad: LGU.

Lenin, V. I. 1960. Konspekt knigi Gegelja "Nayka logiki". Polnoe sobranie sotšhineni. Vol. 29. Moskva: Politizdat.

Leontjev, A. N. 1975. Dejatelnost. Soznanie. Litšnost. Moskva: Politizdat.

Leontjev, A. N. 1981. Problemi razvitija psihiki. Moskva: MGU.

Levitov, N. D. 1960. Detskaja i pedagogitšeskaja psihologija. Moskva: Utšpedgiz.

Lomov, B. F. 1977. Problema biologitšeskovo i sotsialnovo v psihologii. Biologitšeskoe i sotsialnoe v razvitii tšeloveka. Moskva: Nauka.

Lomov, B. F. 1982. Problema litšnosti v sovetskoi psihologitšeskoi nauke. Problemi psihologi litšnosti. Moskva: Nauka.

Lomov, B. F. 1984. Metodologitšeskie i teoretitšeskie problemi psihologii. Moskva: Nauka.

Marx, K. Kritika polititšeskoi ekonomii. In Marx, K. & F. Engels. Sotšinenija 2. Vol. 46. Moskva: Politizdat.

Marx, K. & F. Engels. Nemetskaja ideologija. Sotš. 2. Vol. 3. Moskva: Politizdat, 7 - 544.

Merlin, B. C. 1970. Problemi eksperimentalnoi psihologii litšnosti. Utšenie zapiski. Vol. 77. Perm.

Merlin, B. C. 1971. Dostiženija i perspektivi sovetskoi psihologii litšnosti v svete leninskih idei. Sovetskaja psihologija litšnosti v svete leninskih idei. Perm.

Merlin, B. C. & I. M. Palei. 1975. Problemi integralnoi harakteristiki individualnosti v differentsialnoi psihofiziologii i ee genetitšeskie aspekti. Perm.

Milts, A. A. 1990. Garmonija i dizgarmonija litšnosti. Moskva: Politizdat.

Mjasištšev, V. N. 1960. Litšnost i nevrozi. Leningrad: LGU.

Mjasištšev, V. N. 1960. Osnovnie problemi i sovremennoe sostojanie psihologii otnošhenii tšeloveka. Psihologitšeskaja nauka v SSSR. Moskva: APN RSFSR.

Niskanen, E. A. 1990. Personality as an Educational Phenomenon. Research Bulletin 75. Department of Education. University of Helsinki.

Obštšaja psihologija: Utšebnik dlja studentov pedagogitšeskih institutov. 1977. Moskva: Prosveštšenie, 479.

Parygin, B. D. 1971. Osnovi sotsialno - psihologitšeskoi teorii. Moskva: Mysl.

Pavlov, I. P. 1981. In V. V. Bogôlovsky (Ed.). Obštšaja psihologija. Moskva: Prosveštšenie.

Petrovsky, A. V. (Ed.) 1973. Age-Related and Pedagogical Psychology. Moscow: Prosveshenye Publishers.

Petrovsky, A. V. (Ed.) 1979. Age-Related and Pedagogical Psychology. Moscow: Prosveshenye Publishers.

Petrovsky, A. V. 1982. Litšnost. Dejatelnost. Kollektiv. Moskva: Politizdat.

Platonov, K. K. 1969. Ponjatie "struktura" v utšenii o litšnosti. Problemi litšnosti. Moskva: Nauka.

Platonov, K. K. 1972. Problemi sposobnostei. Moskva: Nauka.

Platonov, K. K. 1972. On Psychology as a System. Moskva: Nauka.

Platonov, K. K. 1974. Sposobnosti i harakter. Teoretitšeskie problemi psihologii litšnosti. Moskva: Nauka.

Platonov, K. K. 1981. Kratkii slovar sistemi psihologitšeskih ponjatii. Moskva: Vyshaja shkola.

Platonov, K. K. 1982. Sistema psihologii i teorija otraženija. Moskva: Nauka.

Platonov, K. K. 1986. Struktura i razvitie litšnosti. Moskva: Nauka.

Professionalnaja dejatelnost molodovo utšitelja: sotsialno - pedagogitšeskii aspekt. 1982. Moskva: Pedagogika, 144.

Psihologija truda i litšnosti utšhitelja. 1976. Leningrad: LGPI, 131-133.

Reinvald, N. I. 1974. Litšnost kak predmet psihologitšeskovo analiza. Harkov. Moskva: Vysha škola.

Rubinštein, S. L. 1957. Bytie i soznanie. Moskva: APN SSSR.

Rubinštein, S. L. 1959. Printsipi i puti razvitija psihologii. Moskva: APN SSSR.

Rubinštein, S. L. 1973. Problems of General Psychology. Moscow.

Rubinštein, S. L. 1976. Problemi obštšei psihologii. Moskva: Pedagogika.

Rubinštein, S. L. 1989. Osnovi obštšei psihologii. Vol. 2. Moskva: Pedagogika.

Šafranskaja, K. D., T. G. Suhanova. 1982. K voprosu o tsennostnyh orientatsijah litšnosti. Litšnost i dejatelnost. Leningrad: LGU.

Samoreguljatsija i prognozirovanie sotsialnovo povedenija litšnosti. 1979. Moskva: Nauka, 264.

Šerbakov, A. I. 1967. Psihologitšeskie osnovi formirovanija litšnosti sovetskovo utšitelja v sisteme vyševo pedagogitšeskovo obrazovanija. Moskva: Prosveštšenie.

Šerbakov, A. I. 1971. Nekotorie voprosi soveršenstvovanija podgotovki utšitelja. Sovetskaja pedagogika. No. 9. Moskva.

Šerbakov, A. I. 1971. Psihologitšeskaja struktura litšnosti i zakonomernosti ee formirovanija. Psihologija litšnosti i pedagogitšeskaja psihologija: teoretitšeskie i eksperimentalnie issledovanija. Leningrad: LGPJ.

Šerbakov, A. I. 1973. Psihologija litšhnosti utšitelja. Vozrastnaja i pedagogitšeskaja psihologija. Moskva: Prosveštšenie.

Šerbakov, A. I. 1979. Psihologitšeskaja harakteristika litšnosti. Praktikum po obshei psihologii. Moskva: Prošveštšenie.

Serov, N. K. 1989. Litšnost i vremja. Leningrad: Lenizdat.

Seržantov, V. F. 1972. Vvedenie v metodologiju sovremennoi biologi. Leningrad: LGU.

Seržantov, V. F. 1974. Filosofskie problemy biologi tšheloveka. Leningrad: LGU.

Skripjuk, I. I. 1986. Vlijanie osobennostei litšnosti utšitelja na adekvatnost otrazenija im vzaimootnošenii v kollektive utšaštšihsja. Avtoreferat dissertatsii. Leningrad: LGU.

Skripjuk, I. I. 1986. Zavisimost intergruppovyh sotsialno-pertseptivnyh sposobnostei pedagoga ot osobennostei tsennostno- orientatsionnoi sfery evo litšnosti. Aktualnye problemy sotsialnoi psihologii. Moskva: APN SSSR.

Skripjuk, I. I. 1989. Sotsialno - pertseptivnye sposobnosti v strukture pedagogitšeskoi dejatelnosti. Sposobnosti i dejatelnost. Jaroslavl.

Šorohova, E. V. 1969. Problemy litšnosti. Moskva: Nauka.

Šorohova, E. V. 1969. Printsip determinizma v psihologii. Metodologitšeskie i teoretitšeskie problemi psihologii. Moskva: Nauka.

Šorohova, E. V. 1971. Vvodnyi doklad po probleme litšnosti kak komplaksnoi probleme sovramonnoi nauki. Litšnost: Materialy obsuždenija problem litšnosti na simposiume. Moskva: Nauka.

Šorohova, E. V. 1974. Psihologitšeskii aspekt problemi litšnosti. Teoretitšeskie problemi psihologii litšnosti. Moskva: Nauka.

Šorohova, E. V. 1975. Sotsialno - psihologitšeskoe ponimanie litšnosti. Metodologitšeskie problemi sotsialnoi psihologii. Moskva: Nauka.

Šorohova, E. V. 1980. Tendentsii issledovanija litšnosti v sovetskoi psihologii. Psihologitšeskii žurnal. Vol. I No. I. Moskva: Nauka.

Sotsialnaja psihologija. 1987. Utšebnoe posobie dlja studentov ped. institutov. Moskva: Prosveštšenie, 224.

Soviet Encyclopedia. 1937. Moscow.

Soviet Encyclopedia. 1954. Vol. 25. Moscow.

Soviet Encyclopedia. 1973. Vol. 14. Moscow.

Šumilin, E. A. 1979. Psihologitšeskie osobennosti litšnosti starseklassnika. Moskva: Pedagogika.

The Encyclopedic Dictionary. 1916. Moscow: Brothers Grant and Company.

Tolstyh, A. V. 1988. Vozrasty žizni. Moskva: Molodaja gvardija.

Tšernyševsky, N. G. 1947. Zametki o žurnalah. Ijun 1856. Poln. sobr. sotš. v 15 tomah. Vol. 3. Moskva: Politizdat. 661-676.

Tugarinov, V. P. 1965. Litšnostj i obštšestvo. Moskva: Nauka

Ušinsky, K. D. 1948. Tri elementa školy. Sobr. sotš. M. L. Vol. 2. Moskva.

46

Utšiteljam i roditeljam o psihologii podrostka. 1990. Moskva: Vyshaja škola, 304.

Uznadze, D. N. 1966. Psihologitšeskie issledovanija. Moskva: Nauka.

Volkov, K. N. 1981. Psihologi o pedagogitšeskih problemah. Moskva: Prosveštšenie.

Vorošilova, C. B. 1978. K voprosu o sotsialno - psihologitšeskoi pertseptsii klassnih rukovoditelei. Minsk.

Vygotsky, L. S. 1973. In A. V. Petrovsky (Ed.). Age-Related and Pedagogical Psychology. Moscow: Prosveshenye Publishers.

Vygotsky, L. S. 1977. In Obštšaja psihologija: Utšebnik dlja studentov pedagogitšeskih institutov. Moskva: Prosveštšenie, 479.

Zaharov, V. P. 1977. Vlijanie strukturnyh osobennostei litšnosti inženerov na ih mežlitšnostnie otnošenija. Psihologija litšnosti i malyh grup. Leningrad: LGU.

Zasorina, L. N. 1982. Sotsialno - psihologitšeskaja adaptatsija utšaštšihsja PTU. Litšnost i dejatelnost. Leningrad: LGU.

Zhamkotshjan, M. S., I. M. Palei. Psihologija litšnosti i malyh grupp I. Leningrad: LGU.

Zobov, P. A., A. B. Lisovsky. 1987. Stanovlenie litšnosti molodovo tšeloveka. L. Znanie: Leningrad.

Zotova, O. I., M. I. Bobneva. 1975. Metodologitšeskie problemi sotsialnoi psihologii. Moskva: Nauka.

xNo. 52 The Ability to Structure Acoustic Material as a Measure of Musical Aptitude. 5. Summary and Conclusions by KAI KARMA. March, 1980. 33 pp.

xNo. 53 The Electronic Hand Calculator in Finnish Comprehensive School Mathematics Teaching by JOHANNES PAASONEN. Oct., 1980. 50 pp.

xNo. 54 Learning Process in Terms of Styles and Strategies. Theoretical Background and Pilot Study by ANNA-LIISA LEINO. Dec., 1980. 40 pp.

xNo. 55 Emotion and Cognition in Visual Art Education by INKERI SAVA. March, 1981. 46 pp.

xNo. 56 Classroom Analysis: Concepts, Findings, Applications. DPA Helsinki Investigations III edited by ERKKI KOMULAINEN and PERTTI KANSANEN. May 1981. 52 pp.

xNo. 57 Psychometric Test Theory and Cognitive Processes: A Theoretical Scrutiny and Empirical Research by JARKKO LEINO. October 1981. 74 pp.

xNo. 58 On the Dynamics of Undergraduate Performance and Dropout by KAJ MALM. April, 1982. 14 pp.

xNo. 59 Learning Process in Terms of Styles and Strategies: Case Studies by ANNA-LIISA LEINO. May, 1982. 51 pp.

No. 60 Research Project on Educational Aims by ERKKI A. NISKANEN & al. June, 1982. 105 pp.

No. 61 Admission to Teacher Education and Two Cognitive Styles by ANNA-LIISA LEINO — ARJA PUURULA. June, 1983. 54 pp.

No. 62 The Helsinki Test. The Inkblots and Using the Test by KARL BRUHN. October, 1984. 49 pp.

No. 63 Realization of Didactic Principles in Foreign Language Teaching in Soviet Schools by LYYLI RONKONEN. November, 1984. 30 pp.

No. 64 An Exploration of the Interpersonal Relationships, Health-Related Behavior and Physical and Mental Health of Finnish University Students by Vello Sermat. October, 1986. 29 pp.

No. 65 The Meaning of Life among Secondary School Pupils. A Theoretical Framework and Some Initial Results by HANNELE NIEMI. January, 1987. 81 pp.

No. 66 Some Principal Results of the Studies Carried out in the Research Project on Instructional Material by VESA A. NISKANEN. October, 1987. 27 pp.

xNo. 67 Assessing Foreign Language Training Needs of Adults. A case study from Finland by KAARINA YLI-RENKO. April, 1988. 90 pp.

xNo. 68 Knowledge in Interactive Practice Disciplines. An analysis of knowledge in education and health care by ANNELI SARVIMÄKI. October, 1988. 276 pp.

xNo. 69 Intercultural Communication as an Aim of English Language Teaching by KAARINA YLI-RENKO. December, 1988. 45 pp.

xNo. 70 Integrating Information in Conceptual Models. Use of an information structure in building conceptual models for behavioural studies by SEPPO KONTIAINEN. January 1989. 59 pp.

No. 71 Theoretical Background and Development of Instructional Materials by JARKKO LEINO. April 1989. 25 pp.

xNo. 72 A Study of Learning Styles by ANNA-LIISA LEINO, JARKKO LEINO and JUHA P. LINDSTEDT. August 1989. 68 pp.

xNo. 73 Nonverbal Intelligence and Foreign Language Learning by IRENE KRISTIANSEN. May 1990. 164 pp.

No. 74 Pluralism and Education in Values by TAPIO PUOLIMATKA. October 1990. 31 pp.

No. 75 Personality as an Educational Phenomenon by ERKKI A. NISKANEN. October 1990. 44 pp.

No. 76 Describing Personality Utilizing the Theory of Fuzzy Systems by VESA A. NISKANEN. October 1990. 16 pp.

No. 77 Modeling System Operators Affecting the Information Organizer of an Individual by RAIMO LAASONEN. May 1991. 104 pp.

No. 78 Use of Conceptual Models in Case Studies. Dynamic Concept Analysis by SEPPO KONTIAINEN. Applications in collaboration with Klaus Helkama, Peter Herriot, John Hobrough, Jyri Manninen, John Roscoe and Malcolm Tight. June 1991. 237 pp.

No. 79 Dynamic Knowledge in School. An Action Research on Instructional Development with the Aid of Microcomputers by JARKKO LEINO. December 1991. 116 pp.

No. 80 Self-Identification of Personality in Social Environment by RAIMO LAASONEN. December 1991. 20 pp.

No. 81 Predictors of Critical Thinking Abilities. A Rasch-Model Approach by PERTTI V.J. YLI-LUOMA. March 1992. 142 pp.

No. 82 Foreign Language Learning and Nonlearning by IRENE KRISTIANSEN. April 1992. 189 pp.

No. 83 Interactive Expertise. Studies in Distributed Working Intelligence by YRJÖ ENGESTRÖM. May 1992. 105 pp.

No. 84 Metaphor: An Educational Perspective by ANNA-LIISA LEINO - MARGARETH DRAKENBERG. April 1993. 70 pp.

No. 85 Policies of Gender and Equal Opportunities in Curriculum Development: Discussing the Situation in Finland and Britain by ELINA LAHELMA. December 1993. 49 pp.

No. 86 The Problem of Personality in Soviet and Russian Pedagogics by LYYLI RONKONEN and IGOR SKRIPJUK. Research Project Personality as an Educational Phenomenon by Professor Erkki A. Niskanen. March 1994. 44 p.

x) Out of print

ISBN 951-45-6613-0
ISSN 0359-5749
Helsinki 1994
Yliopistopaino

BEST COPY AVAILABLE